UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Can Democracy Defeat Russia's Conspiracy?
Leo Hirsch

Man's Dignity and Human Destiny
Randall S. Hilton

Communism Captures the Czech Church
Philip Schug

The Ascetic Despotism - *John Malick*

The Tenets of Theism
Edward H. Redman

Israel Swings to the Right - *Victor B. Fried*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVI NUMBER 6

Chicago, January-February, 1951

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Edwin T. Buehrer: Minister of The Third Unitarian Church of Chicago.

John Forwalter: Minister of the Universalist Church, Stockton, Illinois.

Victor B. Fried: Worldover Press Correspondent.

Randall S. Hilton: Executive Secretary, Western Unitarian Conference, Chicago.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

Homer A. Jack: Minister of The Church of All Souls (Unitarian), Evanston, Illinois.

John Malick: Unitarian Minister now residing in Bethel, Ohio.

Harold P. Marley: Director of Community Services of the Community Child Guidance Centers, Chicago.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

Edward H. Redman: Minister of The First Unitarian Church of Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Joseph Remenyi: Professor of Comparative Literature, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Philip Schug: Minister of All Souls Unitarian Society, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE.....103

ARTICLES—

Can Democracy Defeat Russia's Conspiracy?—LEO HIRSCH.....104

Man's Dignity and Human Destiny—RANDALL S. HILTON.....107

Communism Captures the Czech Church—PHILIP SCHUG.....109

The Ascetic Despotism—JOHN MALICK.....110

The Tenets of Theism—EDWARD H. REDMAN.....112

Israel Swings to the Right—VICTOR B. FRIED.....115

THE STUDY TABLE—

Unorthodox Book—EDWIN T. BUEHRER.....116

A Well-Documented Volume—HOMER A. JACK.....116

Irrationality Made Rational—JOSEPH REMENYI.....117

A Great Spirit—CURTIS W. REESE.....117

The Prophet—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.....117

A Larger Ethic—JOHN FORWALTER.....118

Neglect of Group Therapy—HAROLD P. MARLEY.....118

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS.....119

THE FIELD—

The Dixon Case—EDWIN H. WILSON.....102

Uruguayan Democracy—EARL M. SMITH.....115

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Dixon Case

EDWIN H. WILSON

All efforts to forestall the appeal of the plaintiffs in the Dixon Case —in which 152 nuns and brothers and two priests were forever barred from teaching in the public schools of New Mexico—have failed. It is now quite certain that the defendants (Archbishop of Santa Fe, Bishop of Gallup, and various state and county officials of the state's public school system) will file an answer to the appeal as well as a cross-appeal. Watch this case. It is more comprehensive than the McCollum Case and every bit as important. No excuse can be levied against conditions or persons peculiar to any one locality; the Dixon Case has statewide implications, involving schools in 7 counties and 28 separate school districts.

Plaintiffs were not satisfied with the District Court verdict because at least 30 new nuns were sent in to act as a skeleton staff in a portion of the publicly supported parochial schools or nun-infiltrated public schools. They awaited, presumably, the relaxation of public pressure. The plaintiffs (chiefly Presbyterians, but including some anti-clerical Catholics) present three ultimate questions for determination by the Supreme Court:

1. May religious garb be worn by teachers in the public schools?

2. Are members of various Roman Catholic orders disqualified by virtue of their vows of obedience and poverty and the fact that they have dedicated their services to the advancement of a religious faith to the exclusion of all other worldly objects, in that the orders that said persons belong to are primarily dedicated to the advancement of a particular religious faith to the exclusion of all other objects?

3. Is a payment of state funds to a brother, sister, or priest, a payment to a church or religious order as prohibited by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States?

(Lydia C. Zellers, et al., v. Raymond Huff et al., Appellants Brief-in-Chief. Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico. Page 4.)

When the nuns applied successfully for complete Federal income tax exemption, they did so on the

(*Continued on page* 115)

UNITY

Volume CXXXVI JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1951 No. 6

EDITORIAL

The liberal view that the dignity of individual man may not be violated with impunity, that individual opinions are sacred, and that society's first concern should be for the good of individual persons, represents a way of life in sharp contrast to the totalitarian view that individuals do not count, that opinions are mass products, and that the first concern of man is for the good of the state. These two social philosophies are diametrically opposed and are now engaged in mortal combat. There can be no compromise, and there is not room enough on this planet for both types of society to coexist. A showdown on a world scale is inevitable. Victory for the liberal view cannot be won by ideals alone, nor by arms alone. A preponderance of both will be necessary. Nor can the victory be won quickly. Evil forces operating within liberal society must be vanquished, and right forces still existent in totalitarian society must be cultivated. Defeatism must be challenged at every turn, and the will to win must be kept vitally alive. The struggle will be long and terrifying. There will be setbacks and defeats. And all of our moral and spiritual resources will be called for to back up our physical and material forces. Business as usual and life as usual must give way to the marshalling of our total strength and skill. The vicious and monstrous opposition is vigilant and determined, and flagrantly uses every device of deceit known to chicanery. Such a force can be met only by the united efforts of all the peoples who are unwilling to surrender the hard-won gains of centuries, who value their present liberties, and who want freedom for the future. Bickering over minor issues and seeking partisan advantages must come to an end. The fortunes of mankind are at stake, and lesser matters must await the outcome. The major issue is the survival of all that liberal society holds dear — freedom of thought and speech, of movement and achievement. At such a time and with such values at stake, intellectual and emotional confusion must not be allowed to cause us to waver as we meet the challenge of the greatest foe that liberty has ever faced, viz., the totalitarian conception of human society.

Curtis W. Reese.

Can Democracy Defeat Russia's Conspiracy?

LEO HIRSCH

Machiavelli's Dream has finally come true! Russia's Politburo has plotted to destroy democracy from the earth by any means, however unscrupulous and infamous, indifferent to how many lives it may cost, in order to dominate the world. By words and acts, Russia has clearly revealed to the world the pattern of that plot. Its complete domination of Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and East Germany is well established. The *coup d'état* in Czechoslovakia destroying the most democratic nation in Europe, the blockade of West Berlin threatening the lives of two million Germans and forcing us to use the Air Lift at tremendous cost, the invasion of South Korea, and now the aggression of Communist China—all of these planned and premeditated deeds are further evidence of Russia's determination. Furthermore, her perpetual veto in the Security Council, insulting America and other democracies at every opportunity in the U.N., creating crisis after crisis, blaring ceaselessly by means of its propaganda machine the Big Lie, launching different wars, reveal Russia's deliberate purpose to undermine and destroy America's military power so that it may conquer the world. It is very evident that these local wars in different parts of the world show a process that can be carried on for a long time and thus sap all our military and economic strength, if we permit ourselves to fall into this trap and wreck our nation and the U.N.

Common sense tells us that Moscow could have prevented the invasion of South Korea as well as the aggression of Communist China, but the plot demanded giving them the green light to go ahead. And after giving the green light to these puppets, Russia cries that we are the aggressors and shouts the lie: "Stop, thief." It appears that the ceaseless screaming of the Big Lie and "Stop, thief," and the false accusations have had their effect and are being accepted by millions of men who are misinformed and miseducated. The facts are that the United States has given Cuba and the Philippines independence and self-government and is trying to give Porto Rico the same status. These are the incontrovertible facts and give the positive lie to those who brand us aggressors. During the past five years, we have granted economic aid amounting to 27 billion dollars to occupied areas that have suffered from the war, without any expectation that this huge sum would be repaid. Russia, on the other hand, has bled white all her satellites, as well as those areas which she occupies.

Russia's plot, therefore, is to provoke the U.N., and America in particular, to fight all these different and separate wars—in Korea, China, Formosa, Indo-China, the Philippines and in the greatest danger spot: West Germany. If we were to accept the procedure of this devilish conspiracy, it would unquestionably lead to the destruction of our military and economic strength, the weakening of our civil rights, the elimination of most of our freedoms, the gradual corruption of our democracy, and ultimately regimentation and defeat.

This is the present strategy of Moscow. Direct war with the U.N. is not their immediate approach. The method is to embroil two-thirds of the people of the globe and let them carry on a war of attrition against us. The enemy's present program has one thing in common with the U.N., viz.; the source of fear—fear of war, fear of atomic war. Fear destroys rationality. It is said that love casts out fear, but it is very apparent that fear casts out love. The members of the Politburo and the Communist elite minority that rule Russia with an iron hand are no longer rational beings. Fear has become the very basis and foundation of modern life. Fear exists on both sides, opposes reason and morals, and wills to destroy the precious and priceless freedoms that have been achieved through blood and suffering down the ages.

What does the Kremlin fear? That is more important to know than what we fear. For let us be honest with ourselves and admit that we react to every act of Moscow and we permit their insane acts to influence our acts. Totalitarian oligarchs fear everybody and each other. This we must avoid with all the strength of our moral natures. It is imperative that we in the United States, as well as the nations in the U.N., be united and objective. The Politburo is convinced that America is engaged in organizing an international army to destroy Russia. This is a deep and abiding conviction of the Politburo. They are also deadly afraid of our atom bomb, for they realize that there is no defense against its destructive power. No one has as yet proved beyond any question of doubt that Russia possesses the atomic bomb. The writer believes that Russia does not as yet possess such a bomb as could be used in the same practical way that we used it in Hiroshima. Russia may have advanced to the point where she can create an atomic explosion and yet not a bomb that could be transported over long distances to carry out annihilation. That has been the one deterrent that has prevented Russia from an all-out war.

The question then arises: Though we are separated and divided from Russia and her satellites by their iron curtain, their hates and fears and threats, is it possible for democracy to defeat their conspiracy? In the face of the realities, their open defiance against the U.N.'s demands, their determination to destroy all democracies in their bipolar division of mankind, what ought we do to survive this serious threat to our free existence? The dangers we face are very real and very grave.

I believe that everything depends on how we meet the challenge that now confronts us. We must not be hasty and impulsive but courageous and patient. I start with the firm conviction that we are not all right and the enemy all wrong, that we are not all strong and the enemy all weak, but that the preponderance of right and spiritual strength is on our side.

The outstanding elements in our position are that we have permitted ourselves to be infinitely patient and tolerant against the worst vilification and misrepresentation ever cast upon us in the U.N. and throughout the world, and that, despite the hortatory, accusatory approach of the Soviet Union, we are using the superior human, analytical approach, sincerely trying to find a common basis for world peace.

Russia's greatest weakness, like the weakness of Fascism, is that she does not allow her people or her leaders to be critical and analytical and to face the real facts without distortion.

Since the dictators, Stalin, the Politburo, and the Communist elite, are completely shut off from healthy criticism by the Russian people and are instead surrounded by favor-seeking flatterers, as Hitler and Mussolini were, they gradually lose all sense of self-restraint and exaggerate their own strength and the weaknesses of others. The strength of our democracy lies in the fact that we permit criticism, analysis, and examination, so that the world may achieve a permanent peace. The U.N. is dedicated to the task of achieving world peace; Russia aims at world domination. America's purpose is to aid mankind through the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, and above all through the U.N. to achieve the welfare of all peoples on this earth. Russia's aim is to use most of mankind as pawns to accomplish world domination.

With this goal in view, we must do the following: The very first, indispensable thing we must do to defeat the Russian plot is to build up our own defenses, so that we can meet this world emergency. This of course also implies the defenses of all the free, democratic nations of Western Europe that are in the Atlantic Pact. For there lies our real kinship, our greatest hope and our greatest threat. We must, therefore, for the present at least, be willing to relinquish our noble intentions in Asia, as our common culture and common ground tie us to Europe. China will soon learn, after this honeymoon period of alliance, what Russian domination means and in time China's disillusionment is bound to come and will be an important factor in destroying Communism and the reestablishment of her friendship with the free world. This defense program must be free of German rearmament and remilitarization, because the Germans have not as yet begun to show any signs of repentance or any leaning toward democracy. Such a firm attitude on our part would reestablish confidence in our purpose and our principles. We ought to be aware that the American way of life is not the German way of life, and that it will take a few generations of education to convince them of the values incorporated in democracy.

This defense program must at all times be within the limits of our power to pay and at the same time must never be at the expense of the welfare of the democratic people. Sacrifice and a tightening of the belt, yes. But no deprivation of the physical and mental bases of democratic civilization.

Perhaps the most important duty we have is to put added faith and strength into the U.N., for that organization is the foundation of a World Federal Government—the last and best hope of mankind. The issue of peace and war must be determined by the U.N. When put to the test, the U.N. by an overwhelming majority decided to halt aggression, and now, in this present, critical phase, must have the courage to brand and denounce Communist China with aggression and Soviet Russia as accessory to the deed. The U.N. must convince Russia and the world at this point that it will not lend itself to any form of either rewarding aggression or appeasing it. It must not yield one jot or tittle from the U.N.'s charter, for if it does it will be the death knell to its very existence.

We must show an unwavering loyalty to the U.N., for that is the one organization that is trying to eliminate aggression and safeguard the freedom of man, his dignity, his indefeasible worth, and his inalienable right to live according to his spiritual nature.

We must persist in our willingness to explore every avenue which may result in finding some common ground between East and West that would bring about adjustment and peaceful settlement without any compromises with evil. In order to find this common ground with Soviet Russia, we must have a clear conception of the nature of Communism, so that we may deal with it justly and without any appeasement.

We must in our negotiations never betray those who died in the democratic cause or in the cause of the U.N. to establish world peace. We must never relinquish or surrender our democratic faith and the principles on which it rests. We may be defeated temporarily by trickery and superior numbers, but in the long view we will come out victorious if we hold steadfast to the ideals for which mankind has struggled so long and suffered so much. Right will always appeal to the conscience of mankind and free the world from violence and tyranny.

We must be fully aware that there can be no effective functioning of the U.N. in a One World without the active participation of the Soviet Union and her satellites. History has clearly shown that all bipolar divisions of mankind have resulted in the destruction of both contestants; as examples, we recall the wars between democratic Athens and totalitarian Sparta, between Rome and Carthage.

These are all basic, fundamental, necessary things that we must do and do at once, but they are not enough. The Western democracies must put their own houses in order: politically, economically, and spiritually. Unless this is done, we will ultimately find that our material defenses alone will be shattered like the Maginot Line, and our civilization will lie in ashes. The American way of life must be restated and redefined with such clarity that it may be generally understood, not only in Europe but by all the peoples of the world. What the American way of life stands for goes to the very roots of things and will help to restore the faith of humanity. What are these demands of the democratic way of life? What are the spiritual revolutions that it commands us to undertake in order to win a permanent peace?

The Western nations must abandon the ideas and practices of imperialism and colonialism. It is a gross misconception to believe that the social and political revolutions in India, Asia, and Africa are solely inspired by Communism. We in the United States started the ferment when we broke with Great Britain and stated new ideas and principles of self-government. No program in the world today has any significance which does not integrate itself with the welfare of the common people. We must identify ourselves with the concern of the impoverished people of the world and convince them of our sincere desire to help them.

To put validity and vitality into the democratic way of life, we Americans must purge ourselves of the racial and religious bigotries and prejudices and discriminations that still prevail in large areas of our nation. Otherwise we will not be able to enlist the cooperation of the peoples of Asia and Africa, and surely we will not convince them of our sincerity. The basic problem confronting all the nations of the world is the intimate problem of *human relations*: relations between individual and individual, group and group,

and nation and nation.

Scientific development has given man many helpful, labor-saving gadgets as well as weapons of destruction, but little or nothing to help him to live in peace and harmony with his fellows. Science and religion both are discredited because they have failed to create a world order based on equity and justice and the equality of all peoples.

It is in critical times like the present that we reveal whether we believe in our civil liberties and rights and the obligations involved therein. Democracy is an experiment to test out whether we can trust men with freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, etc. Thomas Jefferson said: "I know no safe depositary of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion by education."

Jefferson fought heroically for the establishment of our civil rights and we in turn must eternally fight for their maintenance and continuance. I believe that it has been a grave error to suppress Communist expression where there is no incitement to force and violence, for this means giving up the essentials of freedom. Young people must be permitted to hear all kinds of philosophies, even subversive ones, in order that they may choose the right in preference to the wrong. It is not at all necessary to suppress democracy to maintain it. We must have faith in our civil rights, and faith that our citizenry will live up to them. We must, in the free trade of ideas, grant freedom of speech. Otherwise we will all be regimented, as were the Germans under Hitler's rule and as the Russians are under Stalin's rule. England is by far more jealous of her civil rights than we are.

In order that we may have a high visibility of our human relations, we ought to call a conference of the foremost social scientists of our nation and of our Allies, so that they may clarify and emphasize the things we already know that can help us to better human relations, and that we may create a better America, better human values, and a better world without strife.

While we are putting forth all of these supreme efforts to combat and defeat Communism, we must also carry out a necessary program of social changes. We will never be able to defeat Communism with the present unbridled monopoly Capitalism. It is very evident that we cannot enlist the people of Europe and Asia in a struggle against Communism to defend a Capitalism whose abuses have brought the world into the present chaos.

Monopoly Capitalism with its unethical emphasis on profits, which also implies consumption without production and hence exploitation, is an anachronism which belongs to the nineteenth century and not to the twentieth. Because we insist on our outmoded economic system, our government most often sends to Europe and Asia and other important posts as its official envoys men who are bankers, millionaires, speculators. We ought to train our ambassadors in statecraft and make them more representative of our democratic way of life. Because of our present world leadership, every action which we take, whether in the foreign or domestic field, has its immediate consequences and repercussions in every country of the world. We must clearly demonstrate to this world that our hearts are deeply concerned with the repairing of the injustices and inhumanities of our social and economic systems and are in accord with the needs of our terrible times. Communism was born in the poverty, misery, and exploitation of the old order and therefore can only be eliminated by establishing a new order, thus depriving the virus parasite of the nourishment on which it lives and thrives.

The democracies must demonstrate to the world that they are capable and fully determined to destroy the abuses to which Communism points and which are its main targets of propaganda. Thus and thus only can we weaken Communism and deprive her of the only reason for being, and by such means we will destroy the origin of a parasitic disease that threatens to engulf and destroy the human race. This method will also save the huge war expenditures that we are applying to cure its ravages and consequences.

If we prize our hard-won freedoms, without which human life has no significance, then we must be willing and eager to sacrifice a great deal to preserve them. We must be unafraid to suggest new forms of social, economic controls designed to safeguard a decent standard of living to all members of society. We must give a respectful ear and be willing to embark on controlled experiments to discover the truth. Democracy and wise courage have time and again proved superior to totalitarian fanaticism.

There is nothing in human history to prove that progress is either steady or inevitable. The powers of darkness have at intervals triumphed over light, truth, and righteousness. The present may be such an interlude when the evil forces of Communism shall submerge the forces of Democracy. Shall we then give up hope? The fact remains that while history does not support such a positive theory of a continuous progress, neither does it bear out the prophets of doom and despair.

A survey of the past shows that previous periods of darkness have been followed by periods of relative light, though there is nothing in our past that in any way appears to guarantee the triumph of the light. However, past dictatorships have not been able to suppress freedom completely. For the more you suppress man's freedom, the greater will be the final explosion which will overthrow the tyranny. Brute power can for a limited time crush the human spirit, but we also know from man's past that the spirit of truth and righteousness has a superior validity and vitality, and thus truth and right, even though crushed to earth for a time, rise again. The Athenian ideal has survived the Roman conquest. Napoleon with all his brilliant military genius could not wipe out the ideal of the French Revolution of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito, with their combined power and their superb war machines, were incapable of destroying the spiritual forces of Democracy.

What we must do in this hour of greatest peril and decision is to live and act in the light and vision of our democratic ideal and, even though it is not as yet fully achieved anywhere on this earth, it at least illumines the purpose and direction in which our efforts should be exerted and dedicated in order that we may create a nobler civilization based on truth, justice, and freedom.

Man's Dignity and Human Destiny

RANDALL S. HILTON

Manifest destiny was the great American dream during the early part of this century. Americans were going to carry the flaming chalice of freedom, the gleaming sword of justice, and the palm branch of peace to the enslaved and benighted peoples of the world. Democracy worthy of the dignity of man was, by our example, to be spread over the face of the earth.

We liberated the Philippines and Cuba. We fought a war to end the tyranny of the Kaiser—and to end all wars. We instigated the League of Nations. It appeared as though we were well on the road to carrying out our great dream. Then something happened. We scuttled the League, we withdrew within our ocean-protected shores. We denied ourselves the soporific of intoxicating beverages. We sought the exhilarating stimulus of gambling. Farm incomes dropped. Small businesses failed. The stock market crashed. Banks closed. In ten short years we plummeted from a land of peace and prosperity into the worst economic depression we had yet experienced. Then we repealed prohibition, took a drink, and began to climb out of the hole into which we had fallen.

But we had lost something. We did not lose our dream of manifest destiny, but the content of the dream had changed. Democracy lost its cutting edge. Security became the key to the future—individual and national security. Then as the economic and military war clouds gathered over Europe in the late thirties, we made of ourselves an arsenal. It was an arsenal of democracy, to be sure, but a very different democracy, for we had lost our basic belief in the dignity of man.

Faith in our own dignity was severely shaken by the depression. This we have only partially regained. The disillusionment brought on by the Second World War seems to have all but annihilated the *universal* concept of the dignity of all men. Distrust and suspicion has become the mental climate in which we live and move and have our being. Of course, we talk a great deal about human dignity being basic to our liberal faith and to democracy. At times one wonders—maybe we protest or profess too much.

Can we as human beings achieve any destiny worth having without a faith in the dignity of all mankind? What contribution can we make? American destiny and human destiny cannot be divorced. They are completely interrelated whether we like it or not.

During every election year there are many people who lose any semblance of personal integrity. Even the "good taste" dictated by social decorum is lost in the mad scramble for personal or party advantage. It is one of the very human frailties that democracy so dramatically demonstrates, that men—even politicians—often strive for goals that are much more practical than principles. A historical study of political campaigns—from Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln on down—clearly indicates that it has always been considered "cricket" for political rivals to vilify each other. Candidates, who were generally lawyers, conducted their campaigns as they did their legal cases. They battled bitterly—with no holds barred—to win the verdict of the judge or jury. Then they would walk out of the courtroom arm in arm, have lunch together, and talk it over.

In recent years something new has been added—something more sinister, more terrible, and more dangerous to human personality and to democracy. This something new is the mental climate of distrust and suspicion, the deliberate creation of fear and even hatred of large masses of people. We despise tyranny and totalitarianism under any name. Yet, the clever and adroit use of those twin totalitarian techniques, fear and hate, is swaying the thinking and opinions of large groups of people. Many have seemingly lost the ability to distinguish between the tyrant and the tyrannized. Woe be unto the man who has ever expressed sympathy for the people who are being ground under the heels of the tyrant!

The fine art of character assassination, guilt by association, the abrogation of civil liberties by the McCarran bill, the incipient political and ideological persecutions, confront us today with a situation which threatens the very existence of democracy and challenges the basic convictions of liberal religion. The rapidity with which the concept of loyalty is coming to mean conformity is alarming.

Am I too pessimistic? I do not think so. I do not think there is a liberal in the land who has not at least once, if not many times, hesitated or refrained from expressing his true convictions for fear of the repercussions of misinterpretation, of misunderstanding. Social pressures and the trend toward conformity weigh heavily. It is a painful experience to watch people of loyal, sound, liberal, religious convictions becoming afraid. But this happens when constructive criticism of, or the expressed desire for, improvement in human relations, human welfare—what is called the American Way—is considered by the hysterically minded as tantamount to espousing a subversive, alien ideology.

Yes, it is a troubled and troublesome world. Faced at home and abroad with grab-bag politics, racial discrimination, migrant exploitation, religious intolerance, and an international situation so complex that it is beyond the comprehension, even the apprehension, of a single mind—the religious liberal must pause and reflect. The question we ask is not the old question: What must I do to be saved? Rather we ask: What must I do to help save the world?

In the days of the sailing vessels when a ship had been sailing for a time through the fog or under a blanketed sky, at the first break in the clouds, the captain would order his navigator to "shoot the stars." We are the "captains of our souls." It is time that we "shoot the stars"—get a focus on the fixed principles that underlie our basic convictions by which we should determine our actions.

One of those basic, fixed principles is devotion to truth. Truth is not something that is established by decrees. No man's words are of themselves true. The fact upon which they are based may be real. His experience may be valid. And yet the interpretation of these facts and experiences may be false. We must recognize facts. We must weigh experience. We also must analyze the interpretations. This we must do

for those who would be our leaders and for ourselves. Facts are universally recognizable. A valid experience is capable of universal understanding. A true interpretation is universally acceptable. Truth is universal and is universally applicable. Any slanting or limiting of the application of truth is of itself a falsification. Whether we are listening to a politician or a preacher or expounding our own opinions, we must look for and weigh the personal prejudices, the special interests, the motivations which influence or weigh the ideas expressed by words. Our first devotion is to truth. We must determine our course by it.

If we are to keep our focus on truth there are certain other precepts or convictions that are necessary. In the first place we must be free to seek the truth. Any limitation on this freedom, whether political or ecclesiastical, limits not only the search for truth but also the application of truth. To equate theological heresy with immorality or economic diversity with subversiveness is to short-circuit truth. It makes a part truth the equivalent of the whole truth. Such short-circuiting will, at least, blow a fuse. It may even burn out the motor or set the building on fire. That is the danger today—that we may blow the fuse of our intellectual integrity, burn out the motor of our social responsibility, and set fire to the house of democracy which we cherish so much. Liberals, especially religious liberals, must insist upon freedom—that freedom which will let us, and all men, search for truth.

"And all men" search for truth. Here is another precept or conviction—our common humanity. When we recognize our common humanity we discover that if some men achieve dignity then all men are capable of achieving dignity. I am not referring to dignity in terms of social status or rank. I am referring to that ennobling quality of character that comes from self-respect and mutual respect. It is the recognition of the inherent or implicit worth of man, of individual men. Men generally live up to those capabilities which their mental and physical capacities and social opportunities provide. This conviction—the acceptance of the principle of the dignity of man—is also essential to our search for truth. If a man does not have self-respect or respect for others, his concept of truth is warped—warped by the limitations of his own ego, the narrowness of his outlook, his inability to practice empathy which is so necessary to understanding and the genuine knowledge of human relations.

In this confused and hysterical age, to preserve the principles of freedom and human dignity it will take courage—the courage of our convictions. Political, economic, and religious orthodoxies are pressing us from all sides. After all, the word "orthodoxy" is only a milder and more polite term for "totalitarianism." It takes courage to insist upon freedom, and human dignity, and universal brotherhood these days. It takes courage to stand up and be counted as an independent and objective person when men's emotions and passions are being fanned into flames by self-styled "Realists" who would be more accurately described as "rabble rousers." Recently a Unitarian layman was fired from his job in a private industry manufacturing military equipment. He had passed the rigid loyalty examinations of the F.B.I. and the Military Security, and he still has their approval. But the plant fired him without explanation and with no warning. The minister and a majority of the members of the church came to his defense. But thirteen members resigned from the church. Not only in that situation, but in others also, I have seen friendships broken and churches split because either convictions were lacking, or courage was absent—all the result of the ravaging cancer of fear. When liberals fall to the low estate of calling each other names and tossing mutual respect out the window, it is time to take stock of ourselves. This takes courage, too. It takes as much courage to examine our own prejudices and rationalizations as it does to speak out for the truth when the truth is unpopular.

Courage can be contagious. In the situation just mentioned, and in others I could name, the people who demonstrated the courage of their convictions have drawn others to them. The result is the fundamental strengthening of the church and the enlarging of its influence. Misery may like company—but so does joy and happiness. Religious liberals must demonstrate their courage now. They must defend and espouse freedom. They must recognize and practice human dignity. They must be dedicated to truth. This, and this only, can reverse the trends that threaten us today and make possible a brighter goal for human destiny.

Courage implies certain risks. Real courage is a calculated risk. There is always the possibility that one may be made to sacrifice. It is a historical truism to say that no gains for the betterment of mankind have ever been made without sacrifice. In our modern world, and particularly in America, man's inhumanity often takes subtle forms. Sometimes there is danger of losing life, limb, or personal liberty. But more frequently the threat is to social prestige, of ostracism, or financial and economic penalties—the loss of one's job. These less damaging and more subtle pressures or persecutions often require more courage and more conviction than major sacrifices. Most of us can take the major tragedies of life with greater equanimity than many minor, persistent irritations.

I once knew a man who became mentally ill because he lost two million dollars in the stock market crash of 1929. The fact that he had one million left was not consoling. Money had become for him the measure of life. With two-thirds of it gone what was there left to live for? Yes, he committed suicide.

To be willing to make any sacrifice our values must be in line with our convictions. We become completely ineffective, if not schizophrenic, when our convictions are those of freedom and human dignity and devotion to truth—and our values are those of social approval, and economic security, and the status quo. I am not saying that if we demonstrate the courage of our convictions that we necessarily will have to sacrifice. I am saying that if we have convictions and we have courage, we must be prepared and willing to sacrifice.

I started out by painting a rather dark and dismal picture of the world in which we live. It was not as dark and dismal as I could have painted it. I think it is realistic. I indicated why I thought this condition existed—the fact that we have put security above integrity. Of course, there is a place for both security and conformity, but they must be within the framework of freedom and integrity. I have presented certain fundamental principles which I am convinced, if practiced, will change all of this for the better. If America's

manifest destiny is to bring about a human destiny that will challenge the minds, command the devotion, and capture the imagination of the peoples of the earth, we have but to prove our devotion to truth, to demonstrate the possibilities of freedom, and to accept the essential dignity of all men. Backing these convictions with sacrificial courage will make our manifest destiny a welcomed destiny and the American Age an era of human dignity and well-being.

Unitarian churches are founded upon these principles: Devotion to advancing truth. Individual freedom of belief. The democratic process. The brotherhood of man. And a united world community. These are the ends and these are the means. It remains only for you and me to put them into practice.

This closing statement came from a young person reporting on the youth section of a meeting on Human Relations in Chicago. "America is the most powerful and wealthy nation on earth. We have fought our way. We have bought our way. It is now essential that we *live* our way."

Communism Captures the Czech Church

PHILIP SCHUG

When the Communist coup of Czechoslovakia was accomplished several years ago it was apparent to anyone who had a working knowledge of Communist methods that the church would be bent to Communist dimensions. The only question was that of the length and severity of the resistance. Evidence that the capture has been completed came to my desk a few weeks ago in the form of a booklet sent directly from Prague. In the booklet are reported the proceedings of a peace conference held at the Spa of Luhacovice to which "all Christian churches" sent delegates. Checking the list of churches represented against the lists of churches known to exist in Czechoslovakia I found no major omissions. They were there.

If such a booklet arrived on your desk you would probably ask several questions including: What are the admitted purposes of the conference? What are the unadvertised purposes? What are the deeper meanings? Let us turn immediately to the first.

From the booklet and the explanatory letter accompanying it, it is exceedingly evident that the main advertised purpose is the promotion of peace. Every delegate whose speech is reported makes a strong plea for peace. But, if the main purpose that is admitted is the promotion of peace, a secondary purpose that is admitted is the pushing of the Stockholm Petition. This petition is the rallying point of the conference. The Stockholm Petition, which has no relation to what the Swedes may think or desire, has as its main objective the disarming of the United States. It is not stated as bluntly as that, but the net effect of carrying out its provisions would be just that. We see, then, that the conference was held as one of the great efforts of the cold war. Our answer to the Stockholm Petition has been the Crusade for Freedom, in which a ten-ton "Freedom Bell" was hung in the town hall in Berlin. We, too, are waging a cold war.

Now many people have asked me if I really believe that the Communist leaders want war. "Surely Stalin does not want war," is the way one person put it to me. "When the Communists make such fervent pleas for peace they must not want war." This concern for peace, and the real desire that most of us have for peace, brings me to the second point of consideration, the unadvertised purposes of the conference.

The unadvertised purposes must, of necessity, be inferences; but they need not be wild guesses. To begin with, the very fact of the gathering is significant. It tells the people of Czechoslovakia and the people of the world that the Czech church is now cooperating with the Communist state. This is the first, and perhaps the major, unadvertised purpose, and it is difficult to underestimate its significance, for the Czech people are a proud people with a strong bent toward personal and national freedom.

A second important purpose that may be inferred is the revelation of how thoroughgoing is this cooperation. To show this we need only quote some of the extracts from the church leaders. A Methodist minister in Prague, Rev. Ladislav Schneider, is reported to have said:

> Our Christian beliefs, based on the Holy Bible, do not permit us to remain silent and inactive in the face of the fanatical propaganda of the Western warmongers. . . . A clear proof of how treacherous and brutal are these instigators of war is the much-vaunted help of the Marshall Plan. . . .

Dr. Karel Haspl, the minister of the largest Unitarian church in Czechoslovakia, is reported to have said:

> Today religion . . . cannot be identified with manufacturers, producers of super-bombs, with racists and fascists. . . . Today, religion, and in particular Christianity, must place itself . . . where conditions are being created for a social system which Jesus in his time called the Kingdom of God, and which we today call Socialism.

The word "Socialism" may be translated "Communism." The latter term never appears in the booklet. Such quotations may be made for all the major denominations. The purpose is evident. It is meant to show how thoroughgoing is the conversion to Communism.

The last important unadvertised purpose now comes forth of itself, though many well-intentioned people will never allow themselves to make the inference. It is this: *The conference was held to carefully plant and nurture the seeds of hatred and war.* Even while they prayed for peace, out of their mouths poured hatred, the seeds of war. This is my answer to those who maintain that the Communist leaders are sincere in their desire for peace and that it is we who are constantly destroying the peace of the world. The fact seems to be that neither of us can stand the other and that we are both whipping ourselves into a lather of hatred. The Communists are smart. They use peace offensives to whip their people into a frenzy of militant aggression, and some of us take it at face value.

Let us turn, in the last place, to some of the deeper meanings of the conference.

The very fact of the conference and the obvious cooperation of the Communist government, together with the renewed emphasis upon religion in Russia, might lead some to believe that the Communist leaders have changed their attitudes toward religion. Such an

inference would be very hasty and faulty. Religion is still not indulged in by party members. It is fit only for the "stupid," but a subservient church is of some value to the Communists. Vice-Premier Fierlinger addressed the conference, and he left no room for doubt that the Czech church would be a subservient one. Said he, "We could not permit any church to misuse the religious sentiments of the people and to misuse its privileged position, by trying to bring back old times, to ascribe to itself more rights than are decreed to it, etc. . . ."

The very rapid capture of the Czech church shows, in the second instance, the extreme pliability of even such a rigid church as the Roman Catholic, for most Czechs are Catholic. The lower clergy are close to the people, and when the chips are down they will stick with the people in their troubles even if they have pledged their full allegiance to the pope.

And a last thing of deep significance to us is the power of Communist doctrine to convince. We must not assume that all of the delegates whose speeches are reported for us were just mouthing unmeaningful words. We must assume that many were convinced and that more will become convinced. The strong faith of a Communist is a marvelous and terrible thing to behold. If there is anything of great value in our system of living, we must discover it and be as devoted to it as they, if it is to last.

The Ascetic Despotism

JOHN MALICK

Running through the story of religion is a speculation that this earth stage is to be used sparingly and still better not used at all. The representation is that the time span is so short that it profitably may be passed up for something later that lasts longer, where what is missed here will be more than made up to those who made the great refusal. The less indulgence here temporarily, the better the chances for permanent satisfactions and delights on ahead. The story is that this part of creation was so affected by an Adversary and man's own defection that the original plan for earth had to be abandoned, leaving this part only an apology heavily penalized. What this originally was meant to be had to be moved on to the next stage after this. The makings for the kind of life livable here became suspect. Disuse of the present provisions became merit, and merit about in proportion to the amount of the world not used.

The Orient always had had its own reasons for keeping aloof from the world. Their goal required drastic curtailment of the kind of living for which this stage is so abundantly supplied. The kind of life that the furnishings indicate for this stage was understood to be at odds with, hostile to, the only kind of life profitable in the long run. St. Paul's list of denials, and why, passed over to Europe and the Americas as the authentic form of Christianity. This went in the face of the Greek's more generous use of the world, by both gods and men, without delaying doubt or such rigid moral connotations. "Christianity initiated an ascetic despotism that continued to exist, now potent, now impotent, but always to be reckoned with."

The ascetic victory never was as complete as churchmen wished and tried to make it, going as it did in the face of the more rational minority and what the majority liked to do and continued to do in spite of all warnings and threats. Between foregoing present satisfactions for the promise of later delights, the bargaining propensity of man played the sure thing today against a future, long delayed and not guaranteed, however extravagant. Those who worked out the system of benefit from escaping the world were the men of the hour with such power and honor as could be had at the time. What they said had authority difficult for the modern temper to understand. The stubborn instincts of the natural man always made any kind of asceticism hard to establish for the common run. Those who worked at it as full-time vocation found it attractive enough and the incentives ample. Most did not take readily to making themselves eunuchs. The speculative inducements for foregoing the world gave scope for only the most ambitious of the religionists. The consequences of not foregoing it were terrifying enough to give pause to the most courageous. But church inducements and disciplines never could bring *all* to the ascetic practices of the masters who had more abundant honor than other kinds of men.

The help of the state always was being solicited by the ecclesiastical side to require by law what gospel persuasion and disciplines could not do. The church made more demands upon its members than the state could make upon its citizens, went into greater refinements each with its commensurate penance, penalty, or reward. Much of this by its very nature was beyond the jurisdiction of the state set up as it was for a rough and ready justice that screened less finely than religion. This was on authority of its own not vouchsafed to the state. The temptation always was present and pressing to make the more refined sins to the church crimes to the state, giving the church the arm of the state to get its disciplines obeyed. This was simpler before the line between church and state was drawn so sharply, simpler when church and state were more nearly one and in a test of strength the church the one. As the church divided and heretical divisions multiplied, each came to have its own special part of life that was forbidden territory for its own. The combined list of sins of all the churches is a formidable one, putting most of the earth scene out of bounds for the faithful. If one for safety first denied himself *all* human activities listed as sins by *all* the churches there would be little left to do.

This sin coverage has included eating in all its phases, each with its list of foods proscribed all the time or at special times. The most thoroughgoing even ventured that eating might be eliminated altogether in the interest of the best form of the good life. On this list are meats, all, or special kinds; animal products such as milk, butter, cheese; tea, coffee, cocoa, anything with any degree of alcoholic content. The refinements went so far as to preclude animal fertilizers, or keeping domestic animals; would free ox and horse

as carriers. Of doubtful import, or worse, generally worse, are cards, dancing, pool, billiards, about all games and sports. Of mental fare, drama came under the ban with fairy tales, fiction, all imaginative and speculative writing except that from the Hebrew surviving in the Book. On the list not to be used are musical instruments in churches or out, symphony, opera, motion pictures, automobiles, riding on trains any time or special days only, then not more than 30 miles an hour; any form of transportation except horse drawn; having one's picture taken, this being a likeness or image and idolatrous. Forbidden are shaving the beard, cutting the hair at all, the wearing of jewelry, ribbons, any attire except that prescribed for the sect.

The sin code at different times has covered the whole educational field, denying education to the laity, especially women; forbidding attendance at public schools or any school where secular science, history, and literature are taught. "The study of science is sin unless it is pursued because it leads to the knowledge of God." "It is the duty of scientists to make their discoveries harmonize with the moral sentiments of the community," which for Europe and the Americas meant a church and Biblically grounded community. Sex runs through the scheme entire, was practically all in the sin field except as permitted within the safe limits of the marriage relation for propagation only. Marriage itself was by sufferance only and for those not up to the marriageless counsel of perfection. An American writer in 1836 reports: "Attempts have been gravely set on foot in the City of New York to obtain written pledges from the sisterhood of married ladies to prevent the design and uses of matrimony in their relation to their husbands."

Sinful to different groups have been all connections whatever with the state or use of it, voting, going to court, taking an oath as witness, serving on juries, paying taxes or defending the state. In the medical field different groups have forbidden any recognition of disease, or use of medical skill, anesthetics, or obedience to the rules of the Board of Health. In the field of ameliorating social evils different sects have listed having any part in social service as sin. Pain, poverty, and generally bad conditions are viewed as proper punishments established by the Management and not to be interferred with. Social conditions at their worst are silver lining to the faithful, giving notice that the final liquidation of earth and man is about due.

Here are things grave and gay, of different values, some matters of personal choice and taste that make but little difference either way. Others challenge the very business of living here at all, getting the world under cover, fed and to bed. Some of these prescribed activities would affect the whole business of lifting the race out of ignorance and deny man his part in widening the distance between all other kinds of life and his own. Government itself, the whole economic and political process would be impossible; the refinements, amenities, and the loveliness of things written off as proper interests of man. In practice each religious group can enforce its code on its own members only, a small part of the whole population. No single body has denied its own *all* the activities listed as sinful by *all* the churches.

Imagination plays upon the possibility of all the churches getting together some time, combining into one master sin list all the different lists of all denominations and sects. Imagination plays upon the possibilities in a democracy where it is within the realm of practical politics to make the sins of any group, or of all groups, crimes to the state. In an age of organization, unified power and propaganda, it is easily within the bounds of probability for churches to get together and submit their entire list of sins for statute enactment. Numerous freedoms would be confronted by a church sin of which the state was bound to take legal notice. This likelihood is increased with the growth of church unity and the entrance of ecclesiastical bodies as pressure groups into power politics. In the event of greater church solidarity the energy once spent on denominational differences might move as a unit on "moral issues." The church books of discipline would go to the Legislative Committee. The slow process of persuasion would be speeded up by the enforcement officer. The speculative punishment of the sin later, which one reasonably may doubt, would be replaced by an officer at the door with a warrant which no sinner could doubt. This process from church sin to statute crime would have the help of one of the most pleasurable of human activities, that of requiring all to have just the virtues and those only that one himself and his community have. Justification for requiring all to do or not what one himself does or not would shelter comfortably for authority under "being my brother's keeper."

Just the stages of human life, back or on ahead, are not known, whether there are such stages before and after and just their order of importance. Those who have brought together all that is known about what kind of world it is have found nothing definite about other stages and their relative importance. The low rating of the world in favor of other worldliness is not from observation; has no universal validity, varies from place to place and cannot successfully be affirmed or denied. The reasoning and bargaining mind increasingly wants to get something out of this chance at the universe whether it is the only chance or one of a number. At the present stage of knowledge it would not be prudent to pass up the present stage entirely. At best it can give satisfaction and even more than that. At the worst few want to get out of it. The vehicle man goes around in seems to be made to use what is supplied here of object and opportunity. Part of it even suggests that it might be kindly meant.

Naturally the rating of this earth stage goes up and down with events, now taking it with gusto, now wanting to escape it. Sensitive souls with time perspective may find even civilization at its best hard to take, to say nothing of the time of break and change. The withdrawals from the world tend to increase as any future, however problematical, looks better than the actual present in hand. The upheavals have been so constant, the difficulty of getting much out of life here so normal and routine that provision for living *in* the world but not *of* it long has been institutionalized. The demand for such escape remains fairly constant however the world is going. Those who have exhausted life to the point of satiety, gone all the rounds early, often enough have been the counselors of living "as if" the world is not here at all or entirely superfluous. The recommended technique is to get into training here for the discarnate kind of living that is presumed to be next after this. It is a world of make-believe, speechless and silent, with the "procreant urge" put into its place which is no place at all for those playing for the highest stakes for the longest time.

The Tenets of Theism

EDWARD H. REDMAN

In a university community a peculiar burden is imposed upon the liberal church, which it might elsewhere escape. Perhaps it would be the part of wisdom even in such a community as this to slip out from under that burden, and proceed as if it did not exist.

In brief, the unusual task which we are called upon to carry out and to fulfil, as best we can, is an intellectual one. It is the task of giving a plausible account of our faith, the task of working out a satisfactory explanation and justification of its constituent elements in the light of scientific knowledge and available facts. This task is never quite complete, partly for the reason that there is more factual knowledge at hand than any one of us can quickly assimilate, and partly for the reason that the interpretation which scholars are inclined to make of these facts is itself a matter of changing emphasis and opinion.

The task, which I feel is peculiarly ours in a church like this and a community like Ann Arbor, is that of helping to create the kind of religious thinking, and the kind of ritual practice, which will function in our lives, under the circumstances which surround us, as powerfully and dynamically as primitive belief and practice, from out of which Christian worship has evolved, once functioned for our remote ancestors.

In claiming this to be our task, I must remind you of the presuppositions which lie behind the claim. One of these has to do with the subjective and personal preferences of religious believers.

As a matter of subjective personal preference, it is quite easy to understand why a person might wish to say, I want a religion which holds to beliefs which are dear to me, and a church in which the ritual is satisfying to me as a matter of taste. This puts belief and ritual on the same basis as the satisfaction of any other aesthetic taste, and it makes no difference at all whether the beliefs to which the religious person pays lip service have any correspondence to true facts or not. All that is important, when religion is considered in this way, is the individual's own private prejudices and preferences. Religion, so considered, is on the same plane as olives or caviar. Some like it and some do not. Nor is anything gained by compiling statistics to show that an overwhelming preponderance of people prefer the commodity. So long as religion is just a matter of taste, even if every living person in the world liked a particular set of beliefs and enjoyed a particular form of ritual practice, those beliefs would still remain unjustified and unvalidated.

Now there is some reason to think that it is the proper business of a church to serve as the institution which caters to the tastes of its clientele, and since there are, as a matter of fact, quite varied tastes, waiting to be satiated, there is room for a wide variety of churches, each specializing in a certain preferred range of delicacies à la carte. For myself, officiating as chef in such an institution, I think it is hard to escape this point of view entirely. One can take some pride in craftsmanship, and one can find pleasure in knowing that one's clientele is appreciative of the specialties of the house, but, to carry the analogy all the way to either the profound or the ridiculous, it is well to be guided by some solid information drawn from the science of nutrition and not seek just flavor and appearance, spice and garnishment alone.

Religion and food have much more in common than one may ordinarily suppose. Probably religious rituals evolved as a part of the apparatus of primitive man for assuring himself an adequate food supply. As we reëxamine the origins of most of the ritual which has come down through the Christian churches, it seems apparent and certain, whatever people participating in today's ritual may think of the matter, that piece by piece Christian worship consists of vestigial remains of primitive attempts to assist nature toward the production of a more bountiful food supply.

At first these attempts were most comparable, for purposes of our present-day understanding, to ballet-like gestures, in which the people tried quite vigorously to depict the pattern of growth and decay, not merely to show their preference for the products of growth and their dismay over the hardships of decay, but to assist growth, and to resist decay. Human energy poured into the rhythmic motions of the dance would have substantial influence in energizing nature. The sheer physical exhaustion which would ensue, so far as the primitives could imagine, would be a depletion sacrificially given for the sake of more powerfully invigorating nature.

So we may say, without going into the heavy documentary detail, that in man's religious development there was first a consciousness of dependence upon nature's productive resources for food supply, and a mode of expression for the transference of human energies to nature. Whether or not the basic myths which go hand in hand with ritual dancing preceded or followed the development of such dancing has not yet been satisfactorily cleared up, but the pattern of waxing and waning, growth and decay, with their correlation to change of seasons and shifts of position in the heavenly bodies was a dramatic one, and it was possible for our ancient forebears to personify the energies at work in the growth and decay process, the changing of seasons, the shifts in the heavenly bodies.

Thus the ritual to assist nature's productivity became interpreted as a dramatic action to assist the progress of the deity or the hero engaged in effecting nature's productivity. In the elaboration of the dance, with its mythological embellishment, the part of the hero became more prominent, and the person chosen to play the part frequently served between performances as the tribal leader, the reigning king, the all-powerful lord of the people, though many are the indications that his fate was an unhappy one, for just as the season of productivity gave way to the barrenness of winter, so, too, the life of the king was sacrificed that a new springtime and a new king might be ushered in.

Not only are these myths and rituals preserved vestigially in the worship of the church, and more concretely in sacred writings which have come down to us in the Bible and elsewhere, but they have also been preserved demonstrably in our legends, our folksongs and dances, our children's playground games, and in our national sports. The fate of the loser in an ancient game of football would have been ritual death, and not merely discomfiture from rejection by disappointed fans.

Down through the centuries more and more ingredients have been superimposed upon the earlier forms of the basic myth and ritual which have just been described. As man acquired new insights and new knowledge he adapted his myths to conform to new concepts. Sometimes a tribe would develop excessively orgiastic elaborations of the basic ritual, imposing upon the people a costly burden of sacrificial requirements; and sooner or later, out of internal conflict, or proximity to other tribes having more moderate practices, there would emerge reformers, striving for a less onerous and less costly mode of religious expression. Sometimes the reformers would succeed in effecting a considerable improvement in the situation for a time, and, then, having achieved fame and having won a firm place in the hearts of the people, their memory in turn was honored by incorporating their preachments into the old ritual, by substituting their names in place of those of earlier heroes, and by the rewriting of their biographies to suit the pattern of life prescribed for the ritual hero.

It is against this background that I wish to discuss a belief which had its beginnings in primitive myth and ritual, partook of many alterations, purifications, and refinements as man climbed upward in his insights, sensitivities, achievements, and aspirations, and remains with us today allegedly by definition as indispensable to religion.

That belief is known as belief in God. For religious liberals it is the one remaining item, coming down to us from days of old, which continues to have much interest as a center for divergent opinion. Quite strangely, too, the difference of opinion has less to do with disagreement as to the facts than with the way in which words shall be used. And the disagreement over the use of words springs ultimately from a difference of opinion as to the emotional needs of people. There are a few items of a highly specialized sort that stand between the judgments of the social scientists on the one hand and the technical philosopher on the other and which enter into the general debate, but I wish to present only a statement of a typical liberal belief in God, mainly with the intention of demonstrating how close it is to what most of us believe when we disavow a belief in God.

I shall take as our guide in this adventure into theism a philosopher of religion from the University of Wisconsin, A. Campbell Garnett, who might possibly be a Methodist, and calls himself a realistic philosopher of religion.

As we take up his book and turn to his discussion of the nature of God, we find him telling us that religion arises from the experience of the disinterested will, within an individual, when he is seeking the good of some other persons under conditions which are in conflict with his own egoistic tendencies. God is thus thought of as a power within us, prompting us to acts of altruism, and bringing us a sense of remorse when we submit to motives of selfishness. But that is not all God is, as Professor Garnett sees the situation. Man's body is a part of a larger physical order, and the disinterested will toward altruism may be thought of analogously as part of a larger spiritual or mental order. To show how it is possible for the God in us to be organically related to God beyond us, Professor Garnett offers the analogy of the white corpuscles in our blood stream to our physical organism as a whole. He reminds us that these corpuscles live a very independent life, moving about freely in the performance of their functions and responding to the stimuli which direct them, yet they are manifestly part of a larger system, drawing from it their independent existence and contributing to its well-being. Now, if each of these corpuscles had as much intelligence as the whole human organism possesses, they would be as puzzled about the meaning of their lives as we find ourselves to be. They could explore the whole body without finding any organisms with capacities for free and intelligent behavior any greater than or equal to their own. Their only inkling that they belonged to any such larger life would be in purposeful structure and functional relations within the whole, and in their experience of finding their own profoundest impulses to be not merely a securing of their own needs but a devotion of themselves to a kind of activity which they might discover to be the good of the whole.

Professor Garnett admits that there are no very obvious facts to indicate the reality of a divine transcendence, but it has been, he says, a very persistent and fundamental item of religious conviction, and he thinks we must account for the reason why this belief has so arisen and persisted. Among the reasons for the rise and persistence of the belief, he thinks, are these: First, the fact, which most suggests that the disinterested will toward altruism is more than a mere part of individual personality, is that disinterestedness of will is in conflict with egoistic tendencies. Where the internal conflict is strongest between altruism and desire, it is at that point that the conviction of divine transcendence is most vivid. When man is faced with strong moral conflict within himself, he feels that he is confronted by something within himself that is greater than himself.

Closely related to the first bit of evidence is the observation that whenever the ego loses the struggle with disinterested will, or altruism, there comes a positive feeling tone and an increase of personal power.

A third bit of evidence, also arising from the same kind of experience, is found in feeling a sense of obligation. A man may disobey and ignore his sense of obligation, Garnett reminds us, but he cannot think about his relations with his fellows without feeling it, and when he disobeys or ignores it he is inflicted with a sense of remorse. The demand which this sense of obligation lays upon the individual often appears not to be any merely human demand, for its power exceeds that of any merely human demand.

Now Garnett recognizes that there are arguments which might possibly refute his view that these three bits of evidence give assurance that altruism has its roots in a spiritual reality which transcends that of the individual mind having the experience. In defense of the first bit of evidence, Garnett raises the question whether or not altruistic desires may not be instinctive or the result of social conditioning rather than manifestations of man's spiritual relatedness to God, but against the anthropologists, the social psychologists, the pragmatists, and their varied friends, Garnett says he is led to a conclusion that substantially endorses that of unsophisticated common sense, namely, that the roots of altruism lie in a spiritual agency, i.e., an agency responsive to values beyond the individual organism—an agency that is concerned with the good of all.

To the second bit of evidence, Garnett offers in its

defense a refutation of those theories of value which describe values in terms of the satisfaction of desire.

Turning to the defense of the second bit of evidence, which, it may be recalled, rested on the observation that when one has succeeded in being altruistic rather than selfish he feels a glow of accomplishment, Garnett appeals to what he calls a principle of creativity common to all organisms. He thinks that this principle of creativity is so organic to the world as to be responsive to the scale of values with which the world presents it. Or to put it another way. Our very organisms depend for their existence upon a spiritual principle.

> In our lives is the experimentation, the failure, and the triumph. Beyond and within us is the abiding Will to universal good. It never controls us, but reveals itself to us in its ultimate determining influence upon what, in the long run, we shall find most truly good.

Parenthetically, I must say that if this is unclear, please do not expect elucidation from me, for I am but reporting what the man said he believed at this point. My candid opinion is that he is making words work harder than they ought, but let us hurry on.

The argument drawn from the sense of obligation, which makes up Garnett's third bit of evidence, is quite controversial for technical philosophy today. Garnett thinks he can answer the major criticisms of his view. I doubt that he succeeds, and I do not concur with him that we have a sense of obligation because the divine will within us and beyond us prompts us to see a duty and to do it. But letting him have his argument for present purposes, it is interesting to notice what he will do with it.

First, the disinterested will which man experiences within and beyond himself may be called God. God exists, then, as a form of will, as an effective structural feature of the world order, a set tendency of the neutral substance which underlies all its other non-physical structures and processes.

Second, since personality is nothing more nor less than an organization of will, God is a Personality; allegedly a Personality which is the source of our personality, and a Personality in which our personalities find their source and their completion.

Third, we may have knowledge of God, Garnett argues, because we have as data the knowledge of our own personalities and wills, and their relation to other wills, and so on to the divine will. To be sure this knowledge is limited, but summarized it consists of this much—and here I quote Garnett directly:

> What we know is that our world manifests in us constructive acts of will, responsive to the values the world presents to experience and directed toward the realization of values beyond our experience. And we have strong reason to believe that this will is not the product of our organisms, but has produced them; that they are organic to it; that it pursues ends in and through them, influencing though not controlling them. We know that our good is found in the service of this larger will and that in and through us it seeks the good of all. Of the content of its experience we know only so far as its experience, of joy and disappointment in its more or less successful efforts, is also ours. Of its origin we do not know, save that it was in the world before us, since our organisms are organic to it. For the same reason it must be prior to all the kinds of particular organic life we know. It is personal, for personality is neither more nor less than a system of will. In this personality our personalities have their foundation and in our personalities this person finds his fulfillment. He is thus not merely a person, but, so far as we know, the only complete Person. This is God, as known in religious experience. It is God, "whose we are and whom we serve," in whom "we live and move and have our being." There is no question of his goodness, for we know him first and best as the higher will that seeks in and through us the good of others.

So saith Garnett, it is plain that we may love God and that we should serve him, but he asks whether or not we may trust God. That God has good will toward men is certain, but does he have any power to do them good?

The answer to the question is both yes and no. So far as the exercises of altruism, prompted by love of God, and sensitivity to the divine influence, help to bring about better conditions of life the answer seems to be yes, and if believing in God helps us to preserve optimism in the face of grave threats to the values of which we approve, then that, too, is helpful to man's condition. But if we ask whether God is able to order the behavior of men and shape the course of physical events in accordance with his will, then the answer is no. Garnett thinks God has enough influence over physical events to safeguard our faith in immortality and the validity of values, but the general formula of his position is "that God is able to influence but not control the course of human behavior and our mental activity has some effect upon physical process." If mental activity can influence physical processes, then divine activity, being mental activity of a higher order, can influence, too.

Garnett has sought to present for us a description of the kind of God which is known through the religious experience. And religious experience, it may be remembered, was described in terms of the situation in which a disinterested will, well-disposed toward other persons, finds itself in conflict with selfish interests and impulses.

This is substantially the kind of belief in God which is acceptable today in varied circles of liberal Protestantism, and in large segments of Unitarianism. It is supported by the philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead, and the philosophy of religion of E. S. Brightman. Apart from the challenge of the reactionary new irrationalism of Niebuhr, and the continental theologians between the wars, its claim to be the dominant Protestant theological view is hardly to be questioned.

At the outset of the discussion, I mentioned that our disagreement with the position has more to do with the use of words than with real conflicts of aim, motives, and evaluation. We, too, approve—indeed we love—the manifestations of disinterested altruism, whenever and wherever it appears, and we feel a sense of obligation to labor for those reforms which will assist its increase throughout human society. We experience the satisfaction, the contentment, and the sense of power, which spring from deeds well done for others, despite the pains to self. We feel that these manifestations and these experiences are characteristically human, some would say humane.

So far, then, we agree on what is worthwhile, we agree on what can be done and what cannot be done. We agree that this is all we can ascertain for sure. We agree that the power to which we give testimony is a power to influence and not to control. We agree that there is no more power than this. Our difference lies in the adjective by which we shall choose to describe that power. To the theist, it is a power divine. To most of us, the same power, neither more nor less, is that which is most remarkably human in the hierarchy of living accomplishment which has emerged until now.

Israel Swings to the Right

VICTOR B. FRIED

In the first election since the parliamentary balloting of nearly two years ago, the people of Israel have shown a definite swing to the right. Voting for municipal and rural officials, the electorate gave heavy backing to the Orthodox Bloc or General Zionists. The conservative triumph was particularly marked in Tel Aviv, which accounts for virtually a fourth of the nation's entire population.

In this key city, the Orthodox group polled more than 30 per cent, as contrasted to its 7 per cent in the parliamentary balloting of January, 1949. The Mapai, right-wing Labor party, moderately left of center, headed by the Prime Minister Ben Gurion, dropped from 34 to 23 per cent. The results were not greatly different in smaller communities.

At first sight, foreign policy will not be affected; most people in Israel favor a policy of neutrality in the United Nations, as in the cold war. Nevertheless, the election result is likely to have important repercussions abroad, especially in the United States.

For that reason, certain aspects of the election, not always understood outside of Israel, need to be noted. One thing of special significance is that some 400,000 new immigrants had their first chance to vote. In Tel Aviv, for example, the electorate had increased by nearly a third. Electioneering was aimed primarily at these new voters. And they could hardly have exercised the influence they did unless many of them were generally dissatisfied with the deepening economic crisis and the fiscal measures taken by the government coalition.

Before the voting, Mr. Itzhak Gruenbaum, a veteran Zionist, declared: "The Orthodox Religious Bloc represents the greatest danger to the state." Left-wing spokesmen charged that "Orthodox Bloc supporters would like to see a Jewish state like that of 2,000 years ago, with a dictatorship of religious fanatics and clericalism."

To such allegations, typical Orthodox leaders replied: "On the contrary, the Religious Bloc demands no more than that Israel, the symbol of longing for generations and now in existence as a result of financial and moral aid from Jews abroad, shall not appear as a secular Levantine-type state imitating foreign culture and devoid of Jewish tradition."

One feature of the election was the delay in giving out the final detailed figures. Soldiers voted by absentee ballots, and if these had been announced separately, later, the number of men under arms would have been known to all the world. The government wishes to keep this number a state secret, for reasons of security.

The Communists, small and unimportant today, wanted to form a common candidates' list with the strongly nationalist, leftist Mapam party, but Mapam leaders refused. One obvious feature of the voting is the failure of the more leftist organizations to cut into the moderate Labor Mapai, of Ben Gurion, as did the rightists. Life is severe enough to have caused an expectation of leftist gains; meat rations are less than half a pound per week, and there are many other shortages.

Another issue of the election was the question of whether or not the running of buses and taxicabs would be permitted on Saturday, the Sabbath Day. The trend to the Orthodox Bloc seems to have answered that question for the present. A really major issue now is that of new parliamentary elections, which many rightist spokesmen are demanding.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 102)

grounds that they were merely agents of the religious orders and did not themselves receive the money. When, however, they shaped their defense against charges of aiding a religious institution by teaching in the public schools, they claimed that they were free individuals and that what they did with their money was no one's business. Can they have it both ways? They have been found to be agents of the religious orders and have accepted tax exemption on that basis. As agents of a religious order, we believe that they should be held disqualified from teaching in a public school. In or out of religious garb, their sworn life-purpose is to advance a particular religion. This case has many other angles, but will bear watching in 1951 on this one issue alone.

Uruguayan Democracy

EARL M. SMITH

Uruguay's recent elections have once again shown the democratic spirit and capacity of this highly important little country. The selection of Martínez Trueba gives the nation a competent President. He is not necessarily any better than his chief opponents, Mayo Gutierrez and Blanco Acevedo, but his lieutenants are more democratically minded than those of his rivals, many of whom took part in the brief Tera dictatorship of 1933, the only stain on nearly 50 years of democratic government.

The election was fair and free, and the campaign hard fought. It is probably the case that no other country in the Western Hemisphere allows so much freedom to the Communist Party; but there were no riots, no direct or indirect restrictions, and yet the Communists lost ground.

To avoid all suspicion regarding the absolute freedom of the campaign, the voting and the counting of ballots, the President appointed as Minister of the Interior, Dardo Regules, respected leader of the small Catholic opposition group called the Civil Union Party. The serious-minded citizen was occasionally disgusted by the absurdities proclaimed by one orator or another. But underneath he enjoyed a loyal and grateful pride that in his great little republic absurdities could be stated, answered, defended, and refuted in wholesome unfearing liberty.

Significant and worthy of imitation is Uruguay's election law, which provides the right of suffrage, not only to all citizens of both sexes of 18 years or older, but also to foreigners of long residence in the country. Once again, Uruguay, long the social laboratory of the Southern Continent, has shown its democratic, moral leadership.

—*Worldover Press.*

The Study Table

Unorthodox Book

PROGRESS IS UNORTHODOX. *By Fred I. Cairns. With a Foreword by Max C. Otto. Boston: The Beacon Press. 185 pp. $2.50.*

This is a delightfully unorthodox book, and, as Prof. Max Otto says in the Foreword, it has been "long overdue." It tells in twelve challenging and informative chapters the story of controversy and of progress, by the slow, halting, and painful process of rejecting the prophets and leaders of the people by the familiar practice of ignoring them as long as possible, then denouncing, rejecting, imprisoning, and crucifying them —and when they are safely dead, reëstablishing them as saints. Progress is a point of departure from the accepted forms of thought, action, and human relations. It is invariably painful to the majority of those who have snuggled down into a niche where life for them is relatively pleasant and satisfying. The chapter headings are challenging, and make it difficult for the reader to resist being drawn into a long reading session. The first chapter, "Do As I Do or Die," plunges one immediately into the earlier Old Testament era in which is depicted a stern deity, who inspired a stern and relentless faith among his followers. But it was the Old Testament prophets who finally brought to light the insight that the price of progress is non-conformity—the refusal, that is, to follow the beaten path.

> The prophets were progressives, forward-looking, and humanity conscious. They cared little for the traditions of their fathers; theirs was the task of doing something about the most important of all problems, human inertia.

The second chapter, "He Died," deals with the meaning of Jesus' crucifixation, which is discussed within the larger context of human martyrdom. It was a human episode, mistakenly conceived as a heavenly phenomenon, and it can be understood only as one also understands and interprets the martyrdom, say, of Socrates, or the banishment of Spinoza.

> They died . . . but their deaths were not fruitless. . . . At least we have come to a point in civilized effort, where killing men like Jesus and Socrates is legally prohibited. They still die, but more and more people are troubled by their death.

In his chapter, "Reform! Reform! Reform!" Mr. Cairns deals with the spirit of the Reformation.

> Reform was the watchword in 1517, but the reformers' work must now be reappraised. . . . Controversy raged because there was a difference of opinion as to the authority of the Church, and its power over the lives of men. . . . And while Luther and Calvin wrote new systems of theology. . . . Erasmus and More told of new objectives for the whole strength of man. . . . The reformers themselves would have done better had they listened to these two men; Luther might have spared himself the terrible crime of his vicious and heartless rejection of the Peasants, and John Calvin might have spared himself the odium of his relationship with Servetus.

It is thus that progress is always, or almost always, unorthodox. This is the recurring theme. One can see from the above quotations what the author attempted to do in the writing of this book. The book is splendidly conceived, and beautifully printed. I wish I could be as sure that the right publisher issued it, and that the right readers could be induced to buy and absorb it. There are points in the above quotations with which it is possible to differ, and there are numerous others for which both space and time are lacking. Were the prophets "progressives" in the modern sense, and "forward-looking"? It is, I think, debatable. Whatever else they were, they were fearfully backward-looking, too. Again, have we really come to the point where "killing men like Jesus and Socrates is legally prohibited"? If one could only be sure! Even so, what difference does it make when there are so many more ingenious methods today of silencing the unorthodox—by keeping them off the air, for example, and out of the newspapers?

But this is quibbling, and I am far too sympathetic with the purpose of the book to quibble very much. Coming back to an earlier comment, however, the question rises: Precisely for whom was this book written? There is the chapter, "Chameleon," in which the author deals rather roughly with the neo-orthodoxy of Reinhold Niebuhr. But can Niebuhrism be so briefly dealt with and disposed of? It is doubtful whether the numerous Biblical references and the comment on Niebuhr will be understood by the very reader for whom this book should be a guide. Most Unitarian layman are probably not sufficiently familiar with either, to get the force of Cairns' argument. If selected chapters of this book could be published in the journals of conservative or orthodox churches, or distributed in pamphlets, they might reach the public for which they were designed. Unitarians and those unchurched agnostics who know nothing about Niebuhr, and care less—and whose ignorance about the Bible is abysmal—are not the right audience for this book. If only the right publisher had sponsored it, and the right audience could be induced to read it, it might bring more able men like Fred Cairns into Unitarianism and Humanism. Why not put a resounding advertisement of this book in *Zion's Herald?*

EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

A Well-Documented Volume

THE ILLUSION OF IMMORTALITY. *By Corliss Lamont. 2nd edition. New York: Philosophical Library. 316 pp. $3.95.*

The Jesuit weekly, *America,* recently threw up its hand in horror when it found that Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, president of Union Theological Seminary, gave what they termed an "astonishing endorsement" to Corliss Lamont's *The Illusion of Immortality.* This fact, together with the Protestant attacks on the Assumption of Mary, add up for the editors of *America* to "the radical rift in the modern world today."

There is really nothing astonishing about anyone's endorsement of this well-documented volume. It is a careful, scholarly work by a professional philosopher on the problem of personal immortality. After surveying the problem from the point of view of science, of theology, and of philosophy, Dr. Lamont concludes that there is no personal life after death. The author does not rub it in, he does not call names, but with determination he comes out with his answer that "the life which human beings know on this earth is the only one they will ever have." Any intelligent reader or scholar could recommend the book and still differ with Lamont's conclusions, for this book contains one of the few reasoned refutations of personal immortality to be published in recent years.

This volume is the second revised edition of a book with the same title published in 1935 by Dr. Lamont. Many tragic things have happened in fifteen years, but to Lamont they only helped to bolster his thesis. This new volume contains a preface-review by John Dewey and some additional material, but not the Appendix of selected poems on immortality which Lamont has since expanded into the well-known anthology, *Man Answers Death.* Every religious liberal should be indebted to Dr. Lamont for his continued scholarship on the problems of life after death and for this plausible answer to this age-old but not solely old-age problem.

HOMER A. JACK.

Irrationality Made Rational

TOWARD DAYBREAK. *By Collister Hutchison. With a preface by Jules Romains and drawings by Marc Chagall. New York: Harper and Brothers. 88 pp. $3.00.*

Perhaps it has never happened before that a universally acclaimed French writer introduced an American poet to the American public in a book illustrated by an internationally recognized artist. *"Si le lecteur de Toward Daybreak veut bien se donner la peine de réfléchir un peu à tout cela, avant d' entrependre sa lecture, il en sera je crois, récompensé"*, writes Jules Romains, after discussing what he calls two quite distinct species of modern poetry, that of improvisation and that which is the product of a rare and slow distillation. Miss Hutchison's poems represent the second manner of creative expression.

There is a mental affinity—not to be confused with imitation—between Miss Hutchison and Emily Dickinson. Their basic orientation is metaphysical. As poets they make the elusive concrete, the intangible tangible; in their works there is an intentional and unintentional obscurity which—paradoxically—produces clarified sensibility. The world is seen and experienced as a conquered symbol, reflecting the intuition and will of the poet. Thus originality is not eccentricity, but the balance of peripheries; a centripetal energy proceeding from the outward to the inward. Its irrationality is made rational as a result of the poet's experience-shaping sense of form, regardless of whether regular or irregular meters are employed.

Besides this metaphysical kinship with Emily Dickinson, one also observes—especially in the minor poems—an echo of the American imagist school. Such poems are immune to verbal frills; they are precise, sometimes crystal clear, but not sufficiently revealing of Miss Hutchison's desire and aptitude to create her own language. Her poetry appeals less to the ear and the eye, and more to the unclassifiable or non-dogmatically religious yearnings of the human spirit. Instead of merely communicating her feelings in a traditional lyrical manner, Miss Hutchison mixes tension and intensity, which at times is responsible for a certain strained expression. One senses an attempt to escape from the tediousness of things or emotional torments which, however, remain disturbing and obstinate. *Toward Daybreak* seems like offerings of sacrifice on the altar of destiny by a creative individual for whom it is a matter of extreme importance to discipline anguish with faith.

JOSEPH REMENYI.

A Great Spirit

THE LETTERS OF ROBERT G. INGERSOLL. *Collected and Edited by Eva Ingersoll Wakefield. New York: Philosophical Library. 745 pp. $7.50.*

Eva Ingersoll Wakefield has done a real service to the cause of liberty by making available to the general public the letters of her distinguished grandfather.

In the Biographical Introduction, and in other interpretative and explanatory material, the author reveals deep insight into the nature of the man and the meaning of his life. While emotional overtones are kept within reasonable limits, it is obvious that the family was devoted to Robert G. Ingersoll. His letters show a wide range of knowledge and interest, and reveal one of the truly great spirits of modern times. His courage and forthrightness made him an inviting target for the narrow-minded, but he paid little attention to his detractors. Only when attacks came from persons worthy of his steel did he engage in personal controversy and debate. The volume is to be commended as both informative and inspiring reading.

CURTIS W. REESE.

The Prophet

KAHLIL GIBRAN; A BIOGRAPHY. *By Mikhail Naimy. New York: Philosophical Library. 267 pp. $3.75.*

There are those who have rather irreverently suggested that the Bible has been replaced on many liberal lecterns by a copy of Kahlil Gibran's *The Prophet.* The inhabitants of Kahlil Gibran's home town of Besharri, Lebanon, can well attest to the continuing popularity of his written works since that village, by virtue of his will, has been receiving the royalties on Gibran's copyrights, and will continue to do so until 1959. Year after year, since the author's death in 1931, *The Prophet* has continued to be a best-seller, while others of his works, like *The Forerunner, The Madman, Sand and Foam, Jesus the Son of Man,* enjoy a continuously lively sale.

Fortunate is the artist who has among his intimate friends one who is capable of writing a sympathetic and literate biography. Such a friend to Gibran is Mikhail Naimy, a leading light in Middle East literary circles. Mikhail Naimy was closer to Gibran than a brother. He knew Gibran's greatness and weakness equally well, and he has written an account of his famous companion's life which is neither maudlin nor heroic.

Interestingly enough, Naimy's style is like Gibran's in many respects. It is lyrical, emotional, sometimes obscure and excessive, but always charming, aphoristic, and philosophical.

Gibran emerges as a very real and vibrant human being, and many of the myths which have been constructed about him are properly exploded.

The common impression that Gibran rotted away to a premature death in extreme poverty and obscurity in a dingy Greenwich Village walk-up is shown to be utter nonsense. It turns out that Gibran was in fairly comfortable circumstances throughout his career and by the time of his death (cirrhosis of the liver) he had become a man of considerable means and property, with a wide circle of ardent admirers and friends.

Gibran's struggle was not with the economic system but with himself. He could never quite decide whether he was another Nietzsche, whom he admired fiercely,

or whether he was such a man as the serene Almustafa (The Prophet). He was divided against himself; the hater of humanity against the lover of humanity; the insatiable egotist against the man of genuine humility; the seeker after fame, wealth, greatness, and glory, against the seeker after light, peace, love, and serenity in the denial of the self.

The life, the loves, the inner struggles of Gibran make interesting reading. His countless devotees will be charmed with this flowing narrative from a sympathetic pen. Gibran's literary style has a limited future, but many of his poetic insights have in them the spark of eternity.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.

A Larger Ethic

The Animal World of Albert Schweitzer. *Edited and translated by Charles R. Joy. Boston: Beacon Press. 207 pp. $3.00.*

Mr. Joy's compilation of excerpts from Schweitzer's writings relating to the theme—reverence for life—intends both a presentation of the idea and a desire to secure the conviction of the reader. The major portion of the book provokes the hunter's fever in one who has looked over his gunsights at bear and leopard, rather than the intended contrary. But the last thirty-three pages are solid meat for those unacquainted with Schweitzer's attempt at a fuller Ethic.

In his chapter on the ethical teachings of India, Schweitzer rightly points out that Hinduism takes the doctrine of *Ahimsa* (renunciation of the will to kill or harm, nowadays partially characterized as non-violence) from the Jainistic reform of the sixth century B.C. (Schweitzer says eighth) and in a subsequent Brahmanic absorption of the Jainist Ethic. He notes that Indian world- and life-negation still fails to implement the intellectualistic sympathy which characterizes the Hindu attitude toward the sacredness of all animal life. Anyone who has seen the "sacred" beasts ignored while they died of starvation will recognize the justness of his analysis.

But in Buddhism the awareness of the suffering of all creatures invokes pity, which Schweitzer says is the result of a true reverence for life. This pity rises to its philosophical peak in Chinese religion: in Mahayana Buddhism, especially in the (circa tenth century) *Kan-Ying P'ien,* and to some extent in early Chinese thought (Kung-tse and Meng-tse).

In a chapter on the necessity for a complete Ethic in the West, and in another on an absolute Ethic, Schweitzer points out that Western philosophy, with the exception of Schopenhauer, has confined Ethics to the relations between men. Schweitzer emphasizes that the will-to-live is in terms of responsibility. This is the grounds of a larger Ethic, the basis of reverence for life.

Any restriction of the above grounds to less than all of life is a truncated Ethic for Schweitzer because it removes man's absolute "guilt" in making decisions. Schweitzer well understands the cruel necessity of sacrificing some life-forms that others may live: he is the doctor destroying disease-organisms, the man of flesh eating other animal flesh. But he demands that the choice of life or death for another creature be conscious, with full awareness of the consequences. This is man's moral "guilt" in decision. Whether a religion that attempts to get away from the concept of "guilt" can remain as persistently aware of the preciousness of life to other creatures than man without this concept is another question.

One wonders if Schweitzer's attempt to build a universal and absolute Ethic should not also more fully consider flora as well as fauna, but perhaps flora are considered non-sensate life-forms.

Credit should be given Mr. Joy for the excellent and full chronology of Schweitzer's life, published as an index to the book.

John Forwalter.

Neglect of Group Therapy

Group Life: The Nature and Treatment of Its Specific Conflicts. *By Marshall C. Greco. New York: Philosophical Library. 337 pp. $4.75.*

This is a study of what the conflicts in group life do to the individual. It is by a clinical psychologist who has moved from the traditional (Freudian) position into what he considers a new orientation in psychotherapy. Specifically, it is an avowal of the causal aspect of group maladjustments in neurosis, together with the concomitant thesis that treatment must follow the same avenue in reverse.

Whereas Freud showed that a hysterical symptom is effected by a motive, Greco goes further and asks "what is the *purpose* behind the motive." He believes that neurotic behavior is merely a manifestation of a psychological need of the individual within a given social situation, and that effective treatment can come only from a therapist who has *social* source material along with his psychological understanding. The author arrived at his present position through counseling experience in penal, industrial, and church (a Unitarian congregation in Pittsburgh) settings. He is now affiliated with the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the University of Michigan.

A serious lack is his complete neglect of group therapy as a significant technique for the accomplishing of the aims he sets up. He apparently does not see the connection between curing group-inspired neuroticism, at least partially, through the offices of group therapeutic situations such as Child Guidance clinics, psychodrama, sociodrama and similar setups for those in need. He does not mention J. L. Moreno and other Adlerian schools, or S. R. Slavson and the American Group Therapy Association. In his description of the improvements necessary in private counseling, he has given credit to Horney, Rogers, Alexander, and French, but has neglected to include the more radical departures from traditional therapy.

Included in the study are many illustrations of case studies together with a painstaking analysis of the basic nature of individual motivation as being of, by, and for the *group,* rather than a recalcitrant egocentricity. The confusion in the book may be ascribed partly to the inevitable problems which arise when two professions, sociology and psychology, come together in their respective efforts to achieve the same end. Greco's use of such terms as "mental science" and "mental specialist" is the projection of a hope which only eclecticism can achieve.

Harold P. Marley.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

WILMA LAPPALA ERKKILA

During the holiday season death removed from the roll of Unitarian ministers Wilma Lappala Erkkila. She was a woman of outstanding personality, complete sincerity, and utter devotion to the cause of liberal religion. Born in Finland, educated in that country and in the United States, she became a liberal and organized the Independent Liberal Christian Church at Angora, Minnesota, in 1916. She served as its minister until the time of her death, a period of thirty-four years. For eighteen years, 1923-1941, she was the minister of the Free Christian Church, Unitarian, in Virginia, Minnesota. During that time she resided in Virginia. Those who knew her will not forget her humanity, her friendliness, and her will to serve.

ORDINATION

Donald Alexander Thompson was ordained by the First Unitarian Church of Chicago on Sunday, January 28, 1951. Mr. Thompson, a graduate of Meadville Theological School, has been active in the fields of research and teaching for the past several years. At the present time while working on his doctorate at the University of Chicago he is employed in survey and research work for the Church Federation of Greater Chicago. He is the son of the late Rev. George Thompson who served several Unitarian churches in New England and was at one time president of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.

DETROIT

The Church of Our Father (Unitarian-Universalist) has secured a new Director of Religious Education. Miss Doris J. Smithers began her work in Detroit on January 1, 1951. Miss Smithers is a graduate of St. Lawrence University and has had experience in both religious education and social work.

UNI-UNI

Dr. Tracy M. Pullman, minister of the Unitarian-Universalist church of Detroit, was elected chairman of the joint Unitarian-Universalist committee exploring the possibilities of a closer federation or union between the two bodies. The committee is made up of seven members from the American Unitarian Association and seven members from the Universalist Church of America. Dr. Pullman was appointed to the committee by the American Unitarian Association. Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, minister of the First Unitarian Church of Chicago, is also a member of the committee.

AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION

The annual meetings of the American Humanist Association were held at the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago, January 23 and 24, 1951. Among the persons participating in the program were Dr. Rudolph Dreikurs, Chicago psychiatrist; Col. Ruby Garrett, Kansas City; Dr. Van Meter Ames, University of Cincinnati; Mr. Loyd Morain, Boston; Dr. A. Eustace Haydon, Chicago Ethical Society; and Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Abraham Lincoln Centre. Dr. Edwin H. Wilson is the Executive Director of the Association.

EXCHANGES

Some recent pulpit exchanges that have taken place within the Conference include:

Cairns of Madison and Mendelsohn of Rockford.

Cairns of Madison and Buehrer of Chicago Third.

Buehrer of Chicago Third and Gilmartin of Ft. Wayne.

McGee of Free Religious Fellowship, Chicago, and Forwalter of Stockton, Universalist.

McGee of Free Religious Fellowship, Chicago, and Gaebler of Davenport.

NEW FELLOWSHIPS

Three new Fellowship Units have been added to the rolls of the Western Unitarian Conference. They are:

Burlington, Iowa
Sangamon County, Illinois
Minnehaha County, South Dakota

At one time there was a Unitarian church in Burlington, Iowa. It is hoped that there will be one again. The same is true of Sioux Falls, South Dakota. A special welcome to this group, the only organized Unitarian group in the State. The Sangamon County group is the second Unit in the vicinity of Springfield, Illinois. When these and perhaps other such units grow and are merged together, the dream of a Lincoln Memorial church in Springfield may become a reality.

PERE MARQUETTE GROUP

Some twenty Unitarian ministers met at the Pere Marquette State Park, Grafton, Illinois, to give serious consideration to the subject of "Religion and Art." This Midwest facsimile of New England's "Greenfield Group" had as discussion leaders John Hayward, Columbus; Thaddeus Clark, St. Louis; Arthur Foote, St. Paul; Aron Gilmartin, Ft. Wayne; Leslie Pennington, Chicago; Robert Raible, Dallas; and Max Gaebler, Davenport.

"Greenfield" may be a more appropriate name for a group of ministers gathered in concentrated contemplation, but this group which met on the banks of the Illinois River where once Pere Marquette slept had this in common with the good Father, they were exploring new areas of interpretation and application of ancient skills.

It probably is a good thing that Marquette was not still sleeping there during the three days of January 29-31. His eternal rest may have been momentarily disturbed. The Unitarian ministers did not sleep too much.

PLANNING AND EXECUTING

Following the Marquette Park meetings the Planning Committee of the Western Conference met in Alton to put the final touches on its report. The publication of its study and suggestions is scheduled for February 26, 1951.

Also following the Pere Marquette group meeting the Executive Committee of the Unitarian Ministers Association met at the Park.

APPEAL APPRECIATION

The United Unitarian Appeal has had certificates of appreciation made. These are to be given to those churches which make or exceed their minimum suggested share. A special presentation service is being planned at the time of the Western Conference meetings. It is hoped that each church which makes its share before April 20, 1951, will have a delegate at the Conference to receive the Award.

As of January 10, 1951, only two churches had qualified for the citation. The secretary of the Conference knows of at least three other churches in the conference which have raised the funds but have not yet forwarded the money to the Appeal Headquarters. Several others will qualify before the meetings and many can if a thorough campaign is undertaken.

BY-LAW HEARINGS

Hearings on the revision of the By-laws of the American Unitarian Association will be held in Meadville Theological School, 5701 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois, on Monday, March 19, 1951, at ten o'clock in the morning. The hearing will be open to any Unitarian interested in or concerned about the By-laws of the Association. The Western Conference members of the commission—Curtis W. Reese, Chicago; David W. Raudenbush, St. Paul; and Perry J. Stearns, Milwaukee—will conduct the hearings. Written comments or suggestions may be sent to the commission in care of Meadville Theological School, or to the Conference office.

USC DRIVE SUCCESS

The 1950 drive for $275,000 for the Unitarian Service Committee was an outstanding success. The official figures have not yet been released but the campaign went well over the top. Of special interest to the Western Conference were the two city-wide drives conducted in St. Louis and Chicago. This was the first time such campaigns had been held in this area. While the results were not what the local leaders had hoped the response was substantial and contributed greatly to the total success of the Service Committee's financial efforts.

UNIQUE CAMPAIGN

The First Unitarian church of Chicago conducted a unique financial campaign this past fall. As far as is known, it is the first time any Unitarian church has combined all of its financial drives, for the local budget, the United Appeal, and the Service Committee. Under the leadership of Professor Albert Hayes the every-member canvass secured contributions and pledges to all three enterprises. Contributions to the Service Committee were to be paid by December 15, 1950, those to the United Appeal by April 15, 1951, and to the church budget during the calendar year of 1951. The result of the canvass was that more money was raised than ever before in the history of the church with substantial increases in contributions to all three agencies.

BOOK POLICY CHANGE

The Western Conference Book Department will no longer fill consignment orders. This change is in accord with the policy of the Beacon Press. The discounts on cash orders will remain the same. This means that those churches which operate book tables will of necessity receive a greater profit on their book business. Book jackets for display purposes will be furnished by the office on request.

MAN OR FISH?

"In some kind of 'Story of the Sea' literature I remember reading about a marauding fish that is so insignificant that it can sidle up to another two or three times its size and arouse no suspicions. However, so elastic are the little fellow's jaws, also his gullet, that once he gets a tooth between the scales of the big fellow the rest is assured.

"The demands made upon our gullibility by recent events make one wonder if possibly our psychological adjustment to reality might be considerably enhanced if we could transform ourselves mentally into much the same kind of swallower. I recall when a lad how we swallowed Czarist Russia, with all its anti-democracy, as our beloved ally in licking the Kaiser. But with the Kaiser's ears well batted down and revolution rampant in Russia, we then turned about and swallowed a modestly remilitarized Germany, and even Hitler himself, to hold the balance of power against the Bolshevised Russians. Then the Hitler rampage and the swallowing of the totalitarian swallower of Finland and Poland, 'Mission-to-Moscow' fashion, in order to lick Hitler's soldier-worshipping Germans, and the treacherous Hirohito Japanese—who were never again going to be trusted with arms. No sir! Never again, not even with the means of making the makings of armaments! And now, far in advance of normal digestion (each generation is supposed to have only one first-class war, and the hatreds thereof) we are asked to regurgitate completely, and swallow a remilitarized Germany and a remilitarized Japan and Fascist Franco himself in order to clean up on our erstwhile 'noble ally' and Uncle Joe!

"All of this may make sense to a fish. He at least gets a good meal and a full pantry. But for us where is the end of it all? Whom next to swallow? And if we can so successfully swallow this prickly pear for that war, and that for this war—how about ingesting a prickly pear for peace? . . . just for the fun of being rational and human for a change!"

—R. Lester Mondale.

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE ANNUAL MEETINGS
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS, APRIL 27-29, 1951